

**REMARKS**

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1, 4-8 and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Kim et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,100,953).

Claims 2 and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kim et al.* in view of *Woo et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,067,140).

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Claims 15-17 have been newly added by the amendment. Accordingly, claims 1, 2 and 4-17 are currently pending.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

Claims 1, 4-8 and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Kim et al.* This rejection is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that *Kim et al.* does not anticipate claims 1, 4-8 and 12-14 because *Kim et al.* does not disclose all of the features of these claims. For instance, it is respectfully submitted that *Kim et al.*'s FIG. 1A does not teach or suggest the claimed combination as set forth in independent claim 1 including at least "one light-shielding layer below each slit pattern," or the claimed combination as set forth in independent claim 4 including at least "one light-shielding layer below the first electrode and the slit patterns." Similarly, it is respectfully submitted that *Kim et al.*'s FIG. 1A does not teach or suggest the claimed combination as set forth in independent claim 8 including at least "forming a first electrode

directly on the insulating layer, the first electrode having a plurality of slit patterns over the light-shielding layer.”

In the rejection, the Office Action appears to assert that the conventional LCD including a side electrode (15) as taught by *Kim et al.*'s FIG. 1A corresponds to the liquid crystal display device including the light-shielding layer as set forth in independent claims 1, 4 and 8. However, *Kim et al.* refers to element 15 as “[s]ide electrode 15.” Column 1, line 37 of *Kim et al.* Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the side electrode (15) as shown in FIG. 1A of *Kim et al.* is not a light-shielding member, and that FIG. 1A of *Kim et al.* does not teach or suggest a light-shielding layer as set forth in the claimed invention.

elec Foole  
Shields light

Further, even assuming that the side electrode (15) of FIG. 1A of *Kim et al.* would function as a light-shielding member (which Applicants respectfully disagree is correct), the side electrode (15) is still not formed below slit patterns of a first electrode. In particular, *Kim et al.* discloses that FIGS. 1A and 1B are sectional views of a pixel unit and one pixel electrode (13) is within a pixel unit. See Column 1, lines 23-25 and FIG. 5A of *Kim et al.* That is, the dashed vertical lines in FIGS. 1A and 1B are boundaries of a pixel unit. Thus, although FIG. 1A appears to show the side electrodes (15) formed below openings, these openings are in fact in-between pixel units, such that these openings are distances between one pixel electrode (13) within a first pixel region to another pixel electrode within another pixel region. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that these openings of FIG. 1A of *Kim et al.* are not slit patterns of a first electrode as set forth in the claimed invention, and that *Kim et al.*'s FIG. 1A does not teach or suggest a light-shielding layer below slit patterns as set forth in the claimed invention.

M.P.E.P. § 2131 states “[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim.” Applicants respectfully submit that since *Kim et al.* does not teach or suggest all of

the features of independent claims 1, 4 and 8, *Kim et al.* does not anticipate claims 1, 4 and 8.

Further, since claims 5-7, and 12-14 depend from claims 1 and 8, it is respectfully submitted that *Kim et al.* also does not anticipate claims 5-7, and 12-14. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 4-8 and 12-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 2 and 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kim et al.* in view of *Woo et al.* This rejection is respectfully traversed at least because claims 2 and 9-11 depend from claims 1 and 8, and because *Woo et al.* fails to remedy the above-discussed deficiencies of *Kim et al.* Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 and 9-11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

**New Claims 15-17**

Applicants have added new claims 15-17 to differently define the invention. Applicants respectfully submit that claims 15-17 are allowable at least because of their dependence from claims 1, 4 and 8.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections and allowance of the pending claims are earnestly solicited. Should there remain any questions or comments regarding this response or the application in general, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310.

If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

Dated: July 3, 2003

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Victoria D. Hao

Registration No. 47,630

**Customer No.: 009629**

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: 202.739.3000

Facsimile: 202.739.3001